

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 4, 2004. Claims 22-39 are pending in this application and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action objected to Claims 22-24 as to certain informalities. Applicants have amended Claim 22 to change “encoding unit” to --decoding unit--. Applicants submit that this objection has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, asserting that certain recitations lack antecedent basis. Applicants have changed “the second video data” to read --the second encoded video data--, and “the first video” to read --the first encoded video--. Applicants believe that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 22-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,529,522 (Ito et al.).<sup>1</sup> Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from Ito et al. at least for the following reasons.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Applicants note that Ito et al. is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 22 is a communication system that includes a first apparatus in a wireless network, a second apparatus in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is arranged to communicate with the first apparatus and the second apparatus.

The communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a decoding unit, an encoding unit, and a second communication unit. The first communication unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first video encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus. The decoding unit is adapted to decode the first encoded video data into video data. The encoding unit is adapted to encode the video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system, and the second communication unit is adapted to transmit the second encoded video data to the second apparatus.

Among other important features of Claim 22 is that the decoding unit decodes the first encoded video data into video data and the encoding unit encodes the video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system.

Ito et al. relates to a communication apparatus with a digital interface. The Office Action states at page 8 that Ito et al. discloses a decoding unit adapted to decode first encoded video data into video data (citing col. 20., lines 8-14; col. 22, lines 1-4; and figure 12), and an encoding unit adapted to encode the video data into second encoded video data (citing col. 20., lines 8-14; col. 22, lines 5-10; and figure 12). Applicants submit that these sections discuss a data conversion unit that converts image data into a data format based on the IEEE 1394 standard, and transfer the data in either an isochronous or asynchronous transfer mode. Applicants submit that nothing in these sections would teach or suggest a decoding unit that decodes first encoded video data into

video data and an encoding unit that encodes video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system, as recited in Claim 22.


Independent Claims 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 include the same feature of decoding first/second encoded video data encoded by a first/second video encoding system into video data and then re-encoding the video data into second/first encoded video data using a second/first encoding system as discussed above in connection with Claim 22. Accordingly, Claims 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 22.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Leonard P. Diana", written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 449901v1